

# **Maintenance Strategies for Design Recovery and Reengineering**

## **Volume 1 Executive Summary and Problem Statement**

**By: Ernest M. Fridge**

(NASA-TM-108260) MAINTENANCE  
STRATEGIES FOR DESIGN RECOVERY AND  
REENGINEERING. VOLUME 1: EXECUTIVE  
SUMMARY AND PROBLEM STATEMENT  
(NASA) 17 p

N93-72512

Unclass

Z9/61 0176372

**June 1990  
Review Copy**

**Software Technology Branch  
Johnson Space Center  
National Aeronautics and Space Administration  
Houston, TX 77058**

6/29/90

Revision 2

7N-61-TM  
176372  
p-17

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The authors wish to thank participants from The MITRE Corporation who helped in the preparation of this document: Lois Morgan, who merged and edited several unpublished documents to form this document, Debra McGrath, who reviewed all volumes and continues to contribute to the design of the environment, and Dona Erb, who also reviewed all volumes.

## CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction	1
2.0	Statement of the Problem	1
3.0	Alternative Solutions	2
4.0	Software Technology Branch's Reengineering History	5
5.0	Maintenance Strategies	6
5.1	New FORTRAN Standards	6
5.2	Design Recovery and Reengineering Methodology	7
5.3	Environment to Support Design Recovery and Reengineering	8
6.0	Conclusions	9
7.0	Glossary	11
8.0	References	13

## FIGURES

Figure 1	Alternative Solutions	3
Figure 2	Data Structure Progression	5
Figure 3	Reengineering Methods	8
Figure 4	Conceptual Architecture of the Design Recovery and Reengineering Environment	9

## TABLES

Table 1	Standards Summary	7
---------	-------------------	---



## ***Executive Summary and Problem Statement***

---

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

Programs in use today generally have all of the functional and information processing capabilities required to do their specified job. However, older programs usually use obsolete technology, are not integrated properly with other programs, and are difficult to maintain. Reengineering is becoming a prominent discipline as organizations try to move their systems to more modern and maintainable technologies. Johnson Space Center's (JSC) Software Technology Branch (STB) is researching and developing a system to support reengineering older FORTRAN programs into more maintainable forms that can also be more readily translated to a modern language such as FORTRAN 8x, Ada, or C. This activity has led to the development of maintenance strategies for design recovery and reengineering. These strategies include a set of standards, a methodology, and the concepts for a software environment to support design recovery and reengineering.

These products and concepts are documented in a five volume report, *Maintenance Strategies for Design Recovery and Reengineering*, of which this is the first volume. This volume contains a statement of the problem and an overview of the STB's approach to solving the problem. Volume 2, *FORTRAN Standards*, defines new FORTRAN standards for JSC; Volume 3, *Methods*, describes the methodology, which is based on experience in reengineering; and Volume 4, *Concepts for an Environment*, presents the concepts and proposed architecture for an integrated environment to support the standards and methodology. Volume 5, *A Method for Conversion of FORTRAN Programs*, records the lessons learned in a pilot project that converted a large FORTRAN program to Ada.

This overview document is intended to provide members of management in the JSC community with a brief description of the problem being addressed and the approach that is being taken by the STB toward providing an economic solution to the problem. Section 2 of this document is a statement of the maintenance problems that are addressed in this document. Section 3 identifies the benefits and drawbacks of three alternative solutions. A brief history of the STB's experience in software reengineering is presented in section 4. Section 5 introduces the STB's new FORTRAN standards, methodology, and the concepts for a software environment to support the standards and methods. The conclusions are summarized in section 6.

### **2.0 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

Based on trends in the computer industry over the last few years, it is clear that computer hardware, languages, and procedures are not static. The software industry recognizes that a large existing software base must be dealt with as new software engineering concepts and software technologies emerge. The old systems use outdated technology and are costly to maintain. At JSC, as in industry at large, there is a large investment in existing FORTRAN software. These FORTRAN systems do not consistently use modern software practices that can increase maintainability. Yet these systems must be maintained for perhaps the next 20 years. Management is seeking ways to reduce maintenance costs.

In the 1960's many FORTRAN programs were developed at JSC, each with its own sizeable software development team, and its own input/output format. These programs could not communicate readily and eventually were "wired" together in a very crude semblance of

## ***Executive Summary and Problem Statement***

---

integration. Even when the former Mission Planning and Analysis Division (MPAD) defined standards, these standards could not be enforced because FORTRAN did not enforce the features and they were not even visible by just looking at the code. The problem was aggravated by the lack of training of new developers plus a 50 percent turnover in the very large MPAD development staff every two years. In addition, other organizations had more people doing development than the MPAD development group, and these other organizations were not always aware of the standards and support tools available from MPAD. This history has left JSC with the following problems:

- Many programs are large and difficult to understand, resulting in maintenance problems.
- The problems in maintenance led to users keeping their own versions of programs, resulting in tremendous duplication.

Many of the FORTRAN programs have already been converted from their original dialect of FORTRAN to the FORTRAN 77 standard. Additional conversions will periodically be required even if only to new FORTRAN standards. It is necessary to consider the question, where will that code have to be in five or ten years? Three possible answers come to mind:

- FORTRAN 77 is the current standard, but the next FORTRAN standard, FORTRAN 8x, is close to release. As vendors stop supporting FORTRAN 77, existing FORTRAN will have to move to the new standard or to another language.
- Much of the code may move to the Ada language. This will be particularly true on Space Station Freedom work.
- With C being the language of choice for Unix and one of the languages selected for Mission Operations Directorate (MOD) projects, such as the Flight Analysis and Design System (FADS), some of the code might move to the C language.

### **3.0 ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS**

Three alternative solutions to the problems identified above have been identified: complete redevelopment of the program, code translation to a more modern language or version of a language, and reengineering. Each of these is illustrated in figure 1 and discussed briefly in the following paragraphs.

Redevelopment of a system from scratch is very expensive. Redevelopment includes all of the same phases of the life cycle as new development, from requirements through integration and testing. Extensive domain analysis is required, and there is a risk of incomplete requirements. All too often it is reported that a large program will be redeveloped from scratch to a more modern style only to find out that the new developers did not understand all of the functions and necessary information requirements of the existing system.

Code translation, especially automatic code translation, costs much less. Some might then ask, why worry about all of this now? We can use a translator when the time comes that we are

## *Executive Summary and Problem Statement*




Figure 1. Alternative Solutions

forced to move the code forward. Although this would be a nice solution, the truth is that code translators have proven unsuccessful due to several major reasons:

- Poor existing control flow is translated into poor control flow.
- Poor existing data structures remain poor data structures.
- Input/output translation usually produces hard to read "unnatural" code in the new language.
- Translation does not take advantage of the code and data packaging techniques available in the newer languages. Attempts to automatically translate some FORTRAN programs to Ada have failed.

Reengineering is the combination of "reverse engineering" a working software system and then "forward engineering" a new system based on the results of the reverse engineering. Forward engineering is the standard process of generating software from "scratch." It is composed of the life cycle phases such as requirements, architectural design, detailed design, code development, testing, etc. In each phase, certain products are required and the activities which produce them are defined. Each product is required to be complete and consistent. To progress forward to a new phase normally requires a new representation of the products which involve more detail such as new derived requirements, design decisions, trade off evaluation between alternative approaches, etc. Finally, code is developed which is the most complete, consistent, and detailed representation of the required product.

## ***Executive Summary and Problem Statement***

---

Reverse engineering is the reverse of forward engineering. It is the process of starting with existing code and going backward through the software development life cycle. Life cycle products are, therefore, obtained by abstracting from more detailed representations to more abstract ones. This process should proceed much faster than forward engineering since all of the details required are available. Reverse engineering starts with the most detailed representation, which has also proven to be complete and consistent since it can currently do the job required. Developing products in reverse involves abstracting out only the essential information and hiding the non-essential details at each reverse step.

How far to go backward in the reverse engineering process before it is stopped and forward engineering begins is a critical question and involves trade offs. It is important to understand all of what the program does, all of the information it handles, and the control flow since these are probably required to get the job done. This implies taking the reverse process far enough to understand *what* the "as is" program is. This is usually more significant than *how* the program does its job since that is usually the part that will be changed in any following forward engineering process.

*What* a program does is called its *requirements*. *How* it meets those requirements is its *design*. For a reverse engineered system it is the design that will be updated more often than what the system will do. Modern software engineering techniques and technologies such as user interfaces, database management, memory utilization, data structuring, packages, object, etc. will affect the design, not *what* the program does. Therefore, once it is understood what the program does and what is obsolete, then the forward engineering process can begin with confidence.

Reverse engineering is referred to as "design recovery" when the reverse engineering process stops at the recovery of the design of the implementation, rather than proceeding on to a higher level of abstraction to include the recovery of the requirements. The basic process of this level of design recovery involves recovery of information about the code modules and the data structures in an existing program. This information will support the programmer/analyst who is maintaining an unfamiliar large FORTRAN program, upgrading it for maintainability, or converting it to another target language.

However, a better job of redesigning a program can be accomplished with requirements recovery than with design recovery. To carry the reverse engineering process beyond design recovery to requirements recovery is difficult and requires higher levels of domain knowledge to do the abstractions. The *whys* of the requirements, design, and implementation can only be provided by someone very familiar with the program and the domain. This level of expertise is often very difficult to find and have dedicated to the reengineering process. For this reason, the methods and tools that the STB has developed initially assume reverse engineering only to the design recovery stage. Future development will be based on feedback from the JSC software engineering community. The current standards, methods, tools, and environment are all designed to be sufficiently flexible and extendible to enable the strategies to be extended to cover the full spectrum of reverse engineering.

The overriding philosophy of this planned reverse engineering process is to capture the total software implementation in an electronic form. This includes source code, documentation,



## ***Executive Summary and Problem Statement***

databases, etc. Figure 2 illustrates the progression of data structures from COMGEN-compatible code (see section 4.0) to reengineered code. This progression in electronic form ensures that the total consistent and complete requirements representation is available. Software tools are provided to support the generation of the more abstract products required for engineering in reverse as well as capturing rationale and decisions of the engineer. By the continuing process of abstracting the information about the program into the different representations, the engineer can remain more confident that information is not being lost or inadvertently "falling through the cracks."




Figure 2. Data Structure Progression

## **4.0 SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY BRANCH'S REENGINEERING HISTORY**

In the early 1970's, the former MPAD's Software Development Branch and TRW/Houston developed a tool, called COMGEN, that began as a COMMON block specification statement generator. It grew to include many other functions as new techniques were developed. Later COMGEN was broken up into a continually evolving set of tools with common data interface structures. This tool set supports the maintenance of FORTRAN programs today on Unisys and multiple Unix systems. People still refer to this tool set as COMGEN tools, and a program that complies with the MPAD standard COMMON concept as a COMGEN-compatible program.

In the 1970's, MPAD performed a lot of software reengineering to meet the goal of combining many of the independently developed engineering programs, each with its own input/output formats. Many of the modern concepts such as separation of input/output processing from the applications, databases, data structures, packages, generics, objects, etc. were recognized and simulated to some degree. They were not called by the modern names, of course, but the design engineers were trying to do good engineering, modularization, and data handling. Even

## ***Executive Summary and Problem Statement***

---

though these techniques were known in the 1970's, they are just now really becoming popular because of newer technologies such as database management systems, user interface tools sets, and modern languages that actually embed and enforce good software engineering practices.

In the late 1980's, some of the personnel and the functions of the Software Development Branch were reorganized into the newly created STB, the Software Technology Branch. In 1989 this branch became a part of the new Information Systems Directorate (ISD). The STB's reengineering history has put JSC in a better position with respect to the maintainability of its older software than many other organizations. The positive results of this experience include the following:

- Most of the software is reasonably modular.
- The data has some structure.
- Most of the software at JSC is reasonably compatible with the STB's tools, including the in-line documentation.
- The large complex programs that support many simulations have considerable software reuse and information sharing.

## **5.0 MAINTENANCE STRATEGIES**

The strategies presented in this document are intended to help with design recovery in support of programmer/analysts who are required to maintain large FORTRAN programs that they did not develop. In addition, these strategies are intended to support reengineering of existing FORTRAN code into modern software engineering structures, which are then easier to maintain and which allow a fairly straight forward translation into other target languages. The STB is proposing standards, methods, and an integrated software environment based upon the significant set of tools built to develop and maintain FORTRAN code for the Space Shuttle. The environment will support these structures and practices even in areas where the language definition and compilers do not enforce good software engineering practices.

### **5.1 New FORTRAN Standards**

New standards, which allow modern software engineering constructs to be used in FORTRAN 77, are defined by the STB in Volume 2. These standards are added to existing standards defined by the former MPAD and still in use in the mission planning and analysis domain. The goal of the new standards is to improve maintainability and permit relatively automated translations to newer languages. In table 1, the standards and their benefits are summarized. These standards address documentation, longer variable names, modern control flow structures, grouping subprograms together as virtual packages, data structuring, and input/output encapsulation in separate subprograms. Where FORTRAN 77 does not provide the constructs, virtual constructs are provided along with a tool environment to support their development and maintenance. The existing core of FORTRAN programmers should have little problem with the standards and new FORTRAN code should adhere to them from the start.

## ***Executive Summary and Problem Statement***

---

Table 1. Standards Summary

Standard	Benefit
Documentation Header statement before code blocks Requirements in CD1 statements Rationale in CD7 statements Virtual package identification	Understandability Understandability and traceability Design knowledge capture Maintenance
Longer, more meaningful variable names	Understandability
Modern control flow structures Block DO DO WHILE	Maintenance and understandability
Grouping subprograms into virtual packages	Higher level of abstraction, understandability
Data structuring Preferred use of calling parameters Controlled use of COMMON blocks	Maintenance Maintenance INCLUDE COMMON database concept
Preferably encapsulate input/output in separate subprograms	Maintenance and support to future conversions

### **5.2 Design Recovery and Reengineering Methodology**

The reengineering methodology defines the steps, the skills required, and guidelines on how far to reverse engineer before deciding to rebuild. The key goal is to update to modern technology and software engineering concepts without losing required functions and data. Methods are provided that have the flexibility to meet multiple levels of conversion, each of which improves maintainability. Figure 3 illustrates five methods. Method 1 converts an arbitrary FORTRAN program to COMGEN-compatible FORTRAN, which provides in-line documentation, data structure, and unique data names within a COMMON structure. Method 2 converts software already in this format to the new "standard" FORTRAN with a more Ada-like structure that is ready for a mostly automated translation by Method 3 to a target language that embeds software engineering principles. Alternatively, COMGEN-compatible programs can be converted directly to a target language like Ada by Method 4. Although it is easier to convert a FORTRAN program when the code already meets the standard COMMON concept, commonly known as COMGEN-compatible, arbitrary FORTRAN can be directly converted to a target language by Method 5. These methods are detailed in Volume 3.


***Executive Summary and Problem Statement***

Figure 3. Reengineering Methods

**5.3 Environment to Support Design Recovery and Reengineering**

The STB's reengineering environment, described in Volume 4, will be built around three components: standards, methods, and tools that support the standards and the methods. It will contain modified versions of the tools used to support the current JSC FORTRAN programs plus commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) tools and additional custom-built tools. The intent is to get an environment out into use in JSC's maintenance community to provide support for upgrading FORTRAN programs in terms of maintainability in the near-term, then to extend the functionality of the tool set and environment in response to feedback from the programmers/analysts. Later versions of the environment may have extensions to handle subject programs written in C, Ada, or even HAL/S, according to requests from the user community.

The environment will be designed with stable interfaces defined to provide for the maximum degree of seamlessness that is possible. It is doubtful that COTS tools can be integrated seamlessly into the environment as no standard interfaces have yet been established for either user interface or data interface (as opposed to data exchange). The tools will be integrated at the front end by a user interface and behind the screen by two logical databases, one containing data passed to and from the tools and the other containing the original and modified source code as shown in figure 4.

## *Executive Summary and Problem Statement*




Figure 4. Conceptual Architecture of the Design Recovery and Reengineering Environment

The environment will not be a completely automated environment since much work will still have to be done by a programmer/analyst. A person must be in the loop to provide the required puzzle-solving skills that are beyond the capabilities of state-of-the-practice tools. However, as an experience base is accrued in design recovery and reengineering, knowledge-based capabilities can be added to the environment.

## 6.0 CONCLUSIONS

Three primary alternative solutions have been identified to solve the maintenance problems of older FORTRAN programs: complete redevelopment of the programs, code translation to a more modern language or version of a language, and reengineering. Complete redevelopment is effective but very costly. Simple code translation is cheap, but usually ineffective since seldom do the old systems incorporate modern software engineering concepts such as good data structuring, good control structuring, packages, objects, etc., that should be present in the new system. Modern languages such as Ada have constructs for representing these features, but translators cannot determine these features in the original code to map them into the new system. Reengineering is being recognized as a viable option because the old systems, in spite of obsolete technology, do contain all of the required functionality and can get the job done. However, at the present time there are only a few expensive Computer Aided Software Engineering (CASE) tools and no total system environment available in the COTS market to support reengineering FORTRAN programs.

The STB maintenance strategies provide standards, methods, and a tool environment for upgrading current FORTRAN systems without losing the embedded engineering knowledge

## ***Executive Summary and Problem Statement***

---

and at a lower cost than for complete redevelopment of the program. Specifically, the goals are as follows:

- Improve maintainability through new technology such as modern software engineering concepts.
- Simplify transportability to new languages or new versions of languages.
- Provide recovery of software design and/or requirements and the capability to reimplement them into more maintainable, modern, and better engineered systems.

This will be accomplished through the following:

- Standards that promote good software engineering concepts that support maintenance and language transportability.
- Methods to reengineer FORTRAN to meet the standards and to translate it to other target languages.
- Environment of tools that support the standards and methods.

With the exception of the generation of the actual code in the specific target language, most of the tools and standards apply to all three paths that JSC software may take in the future: to FORTRAN 8x, Ada, or C.

JSC has a large amount of existing code in FORTRAN that embodies domain knowledge and required functionality. Much of this code matches standards set in the former MPAD and there is a large existing set of tools developed by that organization to maintain FORTRAN 77 code. A useful environment for reengineering JSC software can be built fairly quickly by building upon the existing FORTRAN development and maintenance tools, COTS products, new software and hardware technologies, plus current research into reuse, design recovery, and reengineering. This environment will support reengineering the existing FORTRAN code into more maintainable forms that can also be readily translated into a modern language including newer versions of FORTRAN. Participation and feedback is being sought from the JSC community responsible for maintaining and enhancing existing FORTRAN programs to provide direction for future extensions of the initial environment. This collection of reengineering standards, methods, and environment can result in a considerable savings in maintenance costs for JSC. In addition, they can be a source of technology transfer to the software industry at large.

## ***Executive Summary and Problem Statement***

---

### **7.0 GLOSSARY**

#### **Acronyms:**

CASE	Computer aided software engineering.
CD	CD statement, the in-line documentation standard in the JSC mission planning and analysis domain. For further, the reader is referred to <i>Computer Program and Maintenance Techniques</i> , NASA IN 80-FM-55.
COTS	Commercial-off-the-shelf.
FADS	Flight Analysis and Design System.
ISD	Information Systems Directorate.
JSC	Johnson Space Center.
MOD	Mission Operations Directorate.
MPAD	Mission Planning and Analysis Division, a former division at JSC.
STB	Software Technology Branch.

#### **Terms:**

arbitrary FORTRAN	FORTRAN program that is not compatible with the COMGEN standards long in place for JSC's mission planning and analysis domain.
COMGEN-compatible	FORTRAN program that is compatible with the COMGEN standards long in place for JSC's mission planning and analysis domain. For further information, the reader is referred to <i>Computer Program Development and Maintenance Techniques</i> , NASA IN 80-FM-55.
design recovery	Reverse engineering, the first step for maintenance or reengineering.
environment	Instantiation of a framework, i.e., an integrated collection of tools. It may support one or more methodologies and may also provide a framework for third party tools.
framework	Software system to integrate both the data and the control of new and existing tools; usual components include a user interface, object management system, and a tool set.
FORTRAN 77	ANSI standards for FORTRAN in effect in June 1990.

***Executive Summary and Problem Statement***

---

<b>FORTTRAN 8x</b>	Future ANSI standards for FORTRAN; expected to be approved and released soon; draft standards have been circulated; unofficially referred to as FORTRAN 90.
<b>forward engineering</b>	Process of developing software from "scratch," through the phases of requirements, design, and coding.
<b>package</b>	"A collection of logically related entities or computational resources" (Booch).
<b>reengineering</b>	"The examination and alteration of a subject system to reconstitute it in a new form and the subsequent implementation of the new form" (Chikofsky and Cross); combination of reverse engineering and forward engineering.
<b>reverse engineering</b>	"The process of analyzing a subject system to identify the system's components and their interrelationships and create representations of the system in another form or at a higher level of abstraction" (Chikofsky and Cross); the first step for maintenance or reengineering; reverse of forward engineering; process of starting with existing code and going backward through the software development life cycle.
<b>software maintenance</b>	Process of modifying existing operational software while leaving its primary functions intact (Boehm, 1980).
<b>subject program</b>	Program that is being maintained or reengineered.
<b>virtual package</b>	Package concept as defined by Booch, but implemented either in Ada, which enforces the concept, or in a language in which the concept must be supported procedurally.



## ***Executive Summary and Problem Statement***

---

### **8.0 REFERENCES**

Boehm, B. W., *Software Engineering Economics*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1981

Booch, Grady, *Software Engineering with Ada*, Menlo Park, CA: Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Co., Inc., 1983.

Booch, Grady, *Software Components with Ada*, Menlo Park, CA: Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Co., Inc., 1987.

Braley, Dennis, *Computer Program Development and Maintenance Techniques*, NASA IN 80-FM-55, Houston, TX: NASA Johnson Space Center, November 1980.

Braley, Dennis, *Automated Software Documentation Techniques*, NASA IN 80-FM-55, Houston, TX: NASA Johnson Space Center, April 1986.

Braley, Dennis, *Software Development and Maintenance Aids Catalog*, NASA IN 86-FM-27, Houston, TX: NASA Johnson Space Center, October 1986.

Braley, Dennis, "A Software Recovery Methodology," unpublished internal document, Houston, TX: NASA Johnson Space Center, FR51, January 1990.

Braley, Dennis, "FORTRAN Standards for Future Translation and/or Design Recovery," unpublished internal document, Houston, TX: NASA Johnson Space Center, FR51, January 1990.

Braley, Dennis, *Maintenance Strategies for Design Recovery and Reengineering: FORTRAN Standards*, Volume 2, Houston, TX: NASA Johnson Space Center, June 1990.

Braley, Dennis and Allan Plumb, "An Environment for Software Conversion and Code Recovery," unpublished internal document, Houston, TX: NASA Johnson Space Center, FR51, March 1990.

Braley, Dennis and Allan Plumb, *Maintenance Strategies for Design Recovery and Reengineering: Methods*, Volume 3, Houston, TX: NASA Johnson Space Center, June 1990.

Braley, Dennis and Allan Plumb, *Maintenance Strategies for Design Recovery and Reengineering: Concepts for an Environment*, Volume 4, Houston, TX: NASA Johnson Space Center, June 1990.

Chikofsky, Elliot J. and James H. Cross II, "Reverse Engineering and Design Recovery: A Taxonomy," *IEEE Software*, January 1990.

Clark, Robert G., *Programming in Ada: A First Course*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.



Please  
Return

CENTER RELEASE FORM  
NASA Miscellaneous Publications

7N-61-TM  
176372  
P-17

(1) INSTRUCTIONS:

- ☐ Block 2 has been completed with available information.
- ☐ Complete Block 3 if there are NO Restrictions on the document and it can be distributed to the public.
- OR
- ☐ Complete Block 4 if there are any limitations and the document is only available either FROM a specific office or TO a specific audience (i.e. US Government Agencies only...).
- ☐ Return the completed form to: NASA CASI, Attn: ACQUISITIONS, P.O. Box 8757, Baltimore MD 21240-0757 OR fax form to (301)-621-0134 (Acquisitions Dept).

(2)

Title: Maintenance Strategies for Design Recovery & Reengineering (Volume 1-Volume 4)

Author(s): NASA Johnson Space Center *Fridge, Ernest*

Originating NASA Organization: Software Technology Branch

Report Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Publication Date: June 1990

(3)

☒ PUBLICLY AVAILABLE

*Ernest M. Fridge III* 7/28/93  
Signature Date

(4)

LIMITED:

\*\*    /    / Available Only From: \_\_\_\_\_

   /    Available Only To (USGA, NASA, ...) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

   /    /  
Date